

United States Patent and Trademark Office

CINITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Gnited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bac. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/667,666	09/23/2003	Wen-Chang Chen	CHEN3587 / EM	9104
23364	7590 04/06/2005		EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC			ZIMMER, MARC S	
625 SLATERS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		1732	

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				th	m
-		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/667,666	CHEN ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Marc S. Zimmer	1712		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	fress	
THE - External after - If the - If NC - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron , cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this cor ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Fe This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr		merits is	
Dispositi	ion of Claims				
5)⊠ 6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>8-13</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.			
Applicati	ion Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). pjected to. See 37 CFI	` '	
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National S	Stage	
Attachman	tto)				
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal R 6) Other:	ate	-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/667,666

Art Unit: 1712

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurosawa et al., U.S. patent # 6,011,123 for the reasons made of record in the correspondence dated November 16, 2004.

Response to Arguments

Applicant disputes the validity of the rejection over Kurosawa on the grounds that (i) Kurosawa does not disclose the preparation of a polysilsesquioxane in advance, (ii) the reference is silent concerning the use of an aminosilane coupling agent, and (iii) the present invention does not require the employment of a chelate catalyst as is mandated by the invention taught by reference.

Concerning the first point, Applicant is correct that the formation of a polysilsesquioxane as a reactant to be chemically combined with polyamic acid is not disclosed. Kurosawa only mentions preparing a partial condensate derived from organosilanes and partial condensates are not structurally equivalent to silsesquioxanes. On the other hand, it is notable that the method of claim 8 stipulates only that the silane-derivatized polyamic acid is coupled with a "silicon alkoxide" (tetramethoxysilane, tetraethoxysilane, and the like according to page 10 of the Specification). As was pointed out previously, Kurosawa contemplates an embodiment

Application/Control Number: 10/667,666

Art Unit: 1712

where the partial condensate is prepared in situ, i.e. in the presence of silanederivatized polyamic acid hence claims 8-13 are still rendered obvious.

As for (ii), amino-functional silanes are, in fact, described as silylating compounds for preparing the corresponding derivatized polyamic acid in column 12, lines 39-41.

Concerning the third point, the fact that the instantly claimed invention does not expressly disclose a metal chelate as an ingredient is immaterial as it is open to other components in view of the transitional phrase "comprising".

As an aside, it is interesting that Applicant has summarized the contents of Comparative Example 3 from JP 4-189866 insofar as the Examiner had already made the determination that the teachings of this reference were not germane to the instant invention. (This determination was based on the contents of the abstract. Comparative example 3, on the other hand, teaches a method that does not adhere to what is considered to be Aoki's invention.) In this connection, Applicant states

"in Comparative Example 3, the polyamic acid solution is first reacted with amino coupling agent and then reacted with organosilsesquioxane, which results in aggregation in the solution and thus cannot form into a film. It means that in the JP patent, the organosilsesquioxane should be first reacted and modified with the amino-based coupling agent."

However, reacting polyamic acid with an amino-functionalized coupling agent and then reacting with an organosilsesquioxane is precisely what Applicant is claiming. Indeed,

Aoki teaches a method that mirrors the instant claims more closely than was previously thought to be the case. That being said, Aoki is deficient at least for the reasons that the silsesquioxane polymer is prepared in an ammonia water solution instead of acid and it is not clear that deionized water is used in the subsequent hydrolysis step.

Applicant has said that the method of the comparative example will not produce a product capable of forming a film. It can only be presumed that this statement was made in error because, in that case, Applicant's own invention would, likewise, not result in the preparation of a film-forming solution.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-7 are now considered allowable given that Kurosawa does not teach reacting silane-functionalized polyamic acid with a polysilsesquioxane.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc S. Zimmer whose telephone number is 571-272-1096. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 31, 2005

MARGARET G. MOORE
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER